



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/692,735	10/27/2003	Gerhard Jaehne	38005-0186	9722
26633	7590	04/30/2004	EXAMINER	
HELLER EHRLMAN WHITE & MCAULIFFE LLP			VOLLANO, JEAN F	
1666 K STREET, NW			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 300				
WASHINGTON, DC 20006			1621	
DATE MAILED: 04/30/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/692,735	JAEHNE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jean F. Vollano	1621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,2,4-8,11 and 12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,2,4-8,11 and 12 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 10/231,362.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. The first sentence of the specification states that "This application is a divisional of U.S. Patent Application Serial No 10/231,362 filed August 30, 2002. which is incorporated herein by reference in its entirety.

The instant application takes priority from DE 10142661.5, filed August 31, 2001. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file of the parent application which is 10/231,362.

Double Patenting

A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

2. Claim 2 of this application conflict with claim 2 of Application No. 10/692734. 37 CFR 1.78(b) provides that when two or more applications filed by the same applicant contain conflicting claims, elimination of such claims from all but one application may be required in the absence of good and sufficient reason for their retention during pendency in more than one

application. Applicant is required to either cancel the conflicting claims from all but one application or maintain a clear line of demarcation between the applications. See MPEP § 822.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 1, 4 –8 and 11-12 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1, 3-10 of copending Application No. 10/692,734. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because in instant claim 1 there is a limitation of ON on the indanol benzene ring and not on claim 1 of 10/692,734. There is a CN on the application of 10/692,734 which is not found in the instant claim 1. However the ON could be a typographical error since the examiner has never heard of this terminal moiety and CN is similar to ON. Also the R5 in 10/692,734 is C3-C8 cycloalkyl wherein in the instant invention it is C3-C4 cycloalkyl and C6-C8 cycloalkyl leaving out the C5 otherwise the compounds are the same. Also the pharmaceutical composition in 10/692,734 claim 6 has specific additives whereas the instant invention instant claim 11 just lists the term additional active compounds. The compounds are almost the same except for the two differences cited above and the pharmaceutical compositions and the methods using the compounds of both claims 1 are essentially the same except for the

slight scope difference in the compounds being claimed. There is a very substantial overlap in compounds and methods. There is obviousness type double patenting.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. Claims 1, 4-8 and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1 line 4 there is the limitation of “ON” there is no such moiety that the examiner knows. The parent application has a CN as one of the limitations and it may be that there is a miss typing. However it is unclear what the limitation is referring to and the claim is vague and indefinite.

5. The claims are free of prior art. The prior art including CA:88:190435, CA:54:50305, CA:55:124710 , CA:76:85045, US 6,717,008 and US 6,670,401, teach various sulfoxide indanol derivatives.

CA:88:190435 teaches indanol sulfoxides but R8, R6 are hydrogens which is not found in the instant invention.

CA:54:50305 teaches an unsubstituted naphthylsulfinyl indanol.

CA:55:124710 teaches a series of various sulfoxy indanols but R8, and R6 are always hydrogen.

CA:76:85045 teaches stereospecific isomers of sulfoxyl indanols but R8 and R6 are always hydrogen.

US 6,670,401 teaches the compounds of the instant invention but the claims are not double patenting and the application is not available under 102 since the inventive entity is the same.

US 6,717,008 teaches compounds similar to the instant invention used for weight reduction. However R8 and R6 are hydrogens and there is no motivation to modify the hydrogens.

The prior art does not anticipate or suggest the instant invention being claimed.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jean F. Vollano whose telephone number is 571-2720648. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 6:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Johann Richter can be reached on 571-272- 0646. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/692,735
Art Unit: 1621

Page 6



Jean F. Vollano
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1621

April 28, 2004